

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/806,653	07/23/2001	Eiji Kawaguchi	1270-034	4633	
75	90 04/30/2003				
Lawson Philpot & Persson			EXAMINER		
67 Water Street Laconia, NH 0	Suite 110		ST CYR, DANIEL		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2876		
			DATE MAILED: 04/30/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		"		KAWAGUCHI ET AL.				
		09/806,653		Art Unit				
Office Action	Julilinai y	Examiner	_	2876				
The MAILING DATE	of this communication app	Daniel St.Cy			ess			
Period for Reply	o, 11110 00/////aiii00iii01ii 4/-/			•				
A SHORTENED STATUTO THE MAILING DATE OF T - Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the ma - If the period for reply specified abov - If NO period for reply is specified ab - Failure to reply within the set or exte - Any reply received by the Office late earned patent term adjustment. Set	HIS COMMUNICATION. under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 ling date of this communication. e is less than thirty (30) days, a repiove, the maximum statutory period ended period for reply will, by statute or than three months after the mailin	136(a). In no event, ly within the statutory will apply and will ex	however, may a reply be y minimum of thirty (30) pire SIX (6) MONTHS fi ion to become ABANDC	e timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this comn NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
1) Responsive to com	munication(s) filed on 20	February 2003	<u> </u>					
2a)⊠ This action is FINA I	2b)□ Ti	his action is no	n-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims		41	_					
4)⊠ Claim(s) 1-11,13 and 15-20 is/are pending in the application.								
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
•	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-11,13 and 15-20</u> is/are rejected.							
7)		or election real	uirement					
Application Papers	subject to restriction and/	or election requ	anomon.					
9) The specification is o	ojected to by the Examine	er.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed o	n is/are: a)□ acce	epted or b) ob	jected to by the E	xaminer.				
Applicant may not red	quest that any objection to th	he drawing(s) be	e held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)☐ The proposed drawing	g correction filed on	_ is: a)□ app	roved b)⊡ disap	proved by the Examiner.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.								
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 1								
13)⊠ Acknowledgment is	made of a claim for foreig	n priority unde	er 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)⊠ All b)□ Some *	c) None of:							
-	es of the priority documen							
-	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
14) Acknowledgment is m					pplication).			
	of the foreign language pr	rovisional appli	ication has been	received.				
Attachment(s)	iaue or a ciailli lor dollies	no priority und						
1) Notice of References Cited (PT 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent 3) Information Disclosure Statement	Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5		nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-				

Application/Control Number: 09/806,653

Art Unit: 2876

DETAILED ACTION

1. Receipt is acknowledged of the amendment filed 2/20/03 in which claims independent claims 1 and 6 were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads, US Patent No. 5,636,292, in view of Lofberg, US Patent No. 4,582,985.

Rohoads discloses a steganography method employing embedded calibration data comprising: an information card that stores information data including image data (see figure 24; col. 57, line 30+), wherein the information data includes inherent data that is embedded to the information according to stenography (see col. 2, line 11+); the image is printed on the card (see col. 58, line 58), wherein the image is read using a CCD scanner; and a PIN is used to legitimate the user of the card (see col. 60, line 10+).

Rohoads discloses that a plurality of code keys are contained in the card and suggests that diskette could be used for the storage medium, he also discloses a plurality of stenographic uses including using serial number identifying ownership to users who whish to legitimately use and pay for empirical information (see col. 54, line 53+), but fails to explicitly disclose a memory for storing user information.

Lofberg discloses a data carrier comprising: a memory 6 for storing user identification.

Application/Control Number: 09/806,653

Art Unit: 2876

In view of Lofberg's teachings, it would have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the well known smart card circuitry into the system of Rohoads for storing user's information. Such modification would provide additional storage space to store more information and means to process the user information to effectively identify each user locally before accessing the central processing center. Furthermore, such modification would make the system more practical and more secured wherein authentication could be obtained online and off-line. Therefore, it would have been an obvious extension as taught by Rohoads.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 2/20/03 have been fully considered, but are not persuasive. (see examiner remarks).

REMARKS:

In response to the applicant's arguments that there is no inherent data using stenography, the examiner respectfully disagrees. A modified system would includes inherent data in the memory to reproduce the image of the owner to match with the image printed on the surface of the card.

5. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

" Application/Control Number: 09/806,653

Art Unit: 2876

In this case, the reference suggests that the invention could be used to authenticate users and discloses that cards and diskettes could be used as storage means.

6. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Refer to the rejection above

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel St.Cyr whose telephone number is 703-305-2656. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

Art Unit: 2876

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G Lee can be reached on 703-305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7721 for regular communications and 703-308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

Daniel St.Cyr Examiner

Art Unit 2876

DS April 26, 2003